

**REMARKS**

In the Office Action<sup>1</sup>, the Examiner objected to claim 1; rejected claims 1-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36<sup>2</sup> under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; rejected claims 1-4, 8-15, 19-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,865 to Howard et al. ("*Howard*"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0154180 A1 to Case et al. ("*Case*"), U.S. Patent No. 7,003,546 B1 to Cheah ("*Cheah*"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047293 to Waller et al. ("*Waller*"), U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0047276 A1 to Eisenhart ("*Eisenhart*"), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0144868 A1 to MacIntyre et al. ("*MacIntyre*"); and rejected claims 5-7 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, *MacIntyre*, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0138331 to Hosea et al. ("*Hosea*").

By the present amendment, Applicant cancels claims 2 and 20, and amends claims 1, 5, 14, 15, 22, 23, 25, and 26. Exemplary support for the claim amendments may be found in the specification and figures as originally filed, including paragraphs [0025]-[0027], [0035], and [0036] of the specification. Claims 1, 3-19, 21-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 are now pending, and the rejections of claims 2 and 20 are rendered moot by the cancellation.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office Action may contain statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicant declines to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

<sup>2</sup> Page 3 of the Office Action includes a typographical error with respect to the rejection of claims 1-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, Applicant assumes that claims 1-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 are rejected, and requests clarification if the assumption is incorrect.

**I. Objection of Claim 1**

Applicant amends claim 1 to overcome the objection. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 1.

**II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-19, 21-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 3-19, 21-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. In order to advance prosecution, however, Applicants amend independent claims 1, 14, 25, and 26 to overcome this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

Thus, independent claims 1, 14, 25, and 26, and their dependent claims, fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 3-19, 21-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

**III. Rejection of Claims 1-4, 8-15, 19-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-4, 8-15, 19-26, 28, 30, 32, and 34-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre*. A *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

The key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. Such an analysis should be made explicit and cannot be premised upon mere conclusory statements. See *M.P.E.P. § 2142, 8th Ed., Rev. 6 (Sept. 2007)*. "A conclusion of obviousness requires that the reference(s) relied upon be enabling in that it put the

public in possession of the claimed invention.” *M.P.E.P.* § 2145. Furthermore, “[t]he mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the results would have been predictable to one of ordinary skill in the art” at the time the invention was made. *M.P.E.P.* § 2143.01(III), *internal citation omitted*.

“[T]he framework for objective analysis for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is stated in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q 459 (1966) . . . . The factual inquiries . . . [include determining the scope and content of the prior art and] . . . [a]scertaining the difference between the claimed invention and the prior art.” *M.P.E.P.* § 2141(II).

Independent claim 1 recites a method including, among other steps,

associate implicit context information with the user profile by  
collecting information based on an email and a document of  
the user; [and]

different filtered views of the user profile based on different  
types of context information, the filtered views including a  
first view having the explicit context information, a second  
view having the implicit context information, and a third view  
having the inherited context information.

Combinations of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* fail to teach or suggest at least these features of claim 1.

*Howard* discloses, in relevant part:

A company profile can include demographic data; lists of other companies with which the company has a relationship; in some implementations a list of the maximum permissions that users at the company can be given in creating or managing the profiles of other users and companies; and a list of other users who are allowed to manage the profile of the company. A user profile may include demographic data; permissions given to the user to create and manage the

profiles of other users and companies; a list of permissions given to the user with respect to other objects in the system; a list of preferences of the user for his personal relationship portal; and a list of other users who are allowed to manage the profile of the user. (Col. 7, lines 43-53).

Thus, in *Howard*, user profiles are given permissions based on the permissions assigned to the user's company. Such a disclosure, however, does not teach or suggest "associating implicit context information with the user profile by collecting information based on an email and a document of the user" and presenting "different filtered views of the user profile based on different types of context information," as recited in claim 1. This is because *Howard* merely gives permissions to user profiles based on flags included in a company profile. (Col. 7, lines 43-53). *Howard* does not disclose "collecting information based on **an email and a document** of the user," (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1. Further, *Howard* does not disclose presenting "**different filtered views** of the user profile based on **different types** of context information," (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1.

*Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* do not overcome any of the above-noted deficiencies of *Howard* at least because none of these references teach or suggest "associating implicit context information with the user profile by collecting information based on an email and a document of the user" and presenting "different filtered views of the user profile based on different types of context information," as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, combinations of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* do not teach or suggest "transporting, to the child entity profile, workset context information included in a workset associated with the collaborative task, wherein

the workset defines a work environment including **a communication feature, a collaboration feature, and a user interface requirement,**" (emphasis added) as further recited in claim 1.

For at least the above reasons, the Office Action has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness of claim 1. Thus, the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn.

Independent claims 14, 25, and 26, while of different scope than claim 1, recite features similar to those of claim 1 and are thus allowable over *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* for at least reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1. The remaining claims rejected as being obvious in view of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* are also allowable at least due to their dependence from one of these independent claims.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is therefore respectfully requested and deemed appropriate.

#### IV. Rejection of Claims 5-7 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 5-7 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable in view of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, *MacIntyre*, and *Hosea*, because a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established.

Claims 5-7 and 16-18 depend from one of independent claims 1 or 14. *Hosea* fails to remedy the above-noted deficiencies of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, and *MacIntyre* with respect to independent claims 1 and 14. Consequently, any proper combination of *Howard*, *Case*, *Cheah*, *Waller*, *Eisenhart*, *MacIntyre*, and *Hosea* does

not present a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to claims 1 and 14, and therefore dependent claims 5-7 and 16-18 are allowable.

Accordingly, for at least the above-noted reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant requests the Examiner's reconsideration and reexamination of the application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,  
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: April 23, 2010

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Philip J. Hoffmann  
Reg. No. 46,340